

REMARKS

Claims 24-36 are all the claims pending in the application. By this Amendment, Applicant amends claims 24-36 for improved consistency and clarity. In addition, Applicant adds claims 37 and 38 which are clearly supported throughout the specification. Accordingly, claims 24-38 are all the claims pending in the application.

I. Summary of the Office Action

The Examiner objected to claims 24-27 and 36 and maintained the rejection of claims 24-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

II. Claim Objections

The Examiner objected to claims 24-27 and 36 because of minor informalities. Applicant has revised the claims, and respectfully submits that the claims as now presented no longer include the potential informalities mentioned by the Examiner. Applicant therefore respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw these objections to the claims.

III. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 24, 26, 29-32, and 34-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ham (US 6,039,481), hereinafter referred to as "Ham" in view of Iida (US 5,671,163), hereinafter referred to as "Iida" as evidenced by U.S. Patent No. 5,609,426 to Ito et al., hereinafter referred to as "Ito" and U.S. Patent No. 5,661,550 to Ko, hereinafter referred to as "Ko". Applicant respectfully traverses these grounds of rejection at least in view of the following exemplary comments.

Of these rejected claims, only claims 24 and 34-36 are independent. For example, independent claim 24 recites: “when the operation is set to ON, the operation is performed before the recording head starts recording the recording information onto the recording medium, and *when the operation is set to OFF, the recording head starts recording the recording information onto the recording medium without performing the operation, wherein the operation is initially set to ON or OFF in accordance with a type of print mode comprising a first print mode and a second print mode, the second print mode has a lower print resolution than the first print mode, and wherein in the first print mode, the operation is initially set to ON, and in the second print mode, the operation is initially set to OFF.*”

Applicant respectfully submits that the above-quoted unique features of claims 24 are not disclosed by the prior art of record.

The objective of Ham is to provide a paper width detecting apparatus and method for an inkjet printer in which a photosensor is mounted on a carrier to detect the width of printing paper so that printing is prevented on an area surpassing the width of paper (col. 2, lines 36-42). In other words, Ham discloses that detecting the width of the printing is important to avoid printing in the area that surpasses the width of the paper. Ham, however, clearly does not disclose or remotely suggest turning the paper width operation to OFF based on a type of print mode such that the print mode that has lower resolution is printed without performing the operation.

With respect to the proposed combination of Ham with Iida, Ito, or Ko, Applicant respectfully submits that these references do not compensate for the above-identified deficiencies of Ham with respect to the unique features of claim 24 quoted above.

Specifically, Applicant respectfully submits that *Iida* does not cure the above-discussed deficiencies of Ham. The Examiner alleges that Iida teaches “in case that the operation is set to

OFF, makes the recording head eject the liquid without performing the operation (col. 8, lines 43-59)” (*see* page 3 of the Office Action). Applicant respectfully notes, however, that col. 8, lines 43-59 of Iida disclose the operation where the paper size error is carried out, and the paper size error is a result of detecting a paper size. Therefore, Iida does not teach in case that the operation is set to OFF, makes the recording head eject the liquid without performing the operation. That is, Iida does not disclose or suggest turning off the detection of paper width to perform printing without the detection and that the detection is turned off based on a type of printing i.e., for printing with a lower resolution.

With respect to *Ito*, its objective is to eliminate the necessity of adding to the printer any means of monitoring the width of the different forms (col. 22, lines 54-56). Ito, however, does not disclose or suggest turning off the detection of paper width to perform printing without the detection and that the detection is turned off based on a type of printing i.e., for printing with a lower resolution. Therefore, Ito does not cure the above-identified deficiencies of Ham.

With respect to *Ko*, as is pointed by the Examiner, it describes “image forming operations are performed based on present basic or input values without regard to the actual width of the printing medium (col. 1, lines 58-61)”. This description in Ko does not disclose turning off the detection of paper width to perform printing without the detection and that the detection is turned off based on a type of printing i.e., for printing with lower resolution. In fact, in Ko, there is no detection section and no operation in which a detection section detects the width of recording medium, thus, it is impossible for Ko to cure the above-identified deficiencies of Ham.

In short, Iida, Ito, and Ko do not cure the above-identified deficiencies of Ham. Therefore, Ham in view of Iida, Ito, or Ko does not disclose or suggest “*when the operation is set to OFF, the recording head starts recording the recording information onto the recording*

medium without performing the operation, wherein the operation is initially set to ON or OFF in accordance with a type of print mode comprising a first print mode and a second print mode, the second print mode has a lower print resolution than the first print mode, and wherein in the first print mode, the operation is initially set to ON, and in the second print mode, the operation is initially set to OFF.” For at least these exemplary reasons, claim 24 is patentable over Ham in view of Iida as evidenced by Ito and Ko. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw this rejection of claim 24 and claims 26 and 29-32.

Next, independent claims 34-36 recite features similar to, although not necessarily coextensive with, the features argued above with respect to claim 24. Therefore, arguments presented with respect to claim 24 are respectfully submitted to apply with equal force here. For at least substantially analogous exemplary reasons, therefore, independent claims 34-36 are patentable over Ham in view of Iida as evidenced by Ito and Ko.

Claims 25 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ham, in view of Iida, and further in view of Brookner (US 6,234,694), hereinafter referred to as “Brookner”. Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ham, in view of Iida and further in view of Elgee (US 6,213,659), hereinafter referred to as “Elgee.” Applicant respectfully traverses these grounds of rejections for at least the following exemplary comments.

Claims 25, 27, and 28 depend on claim 24. Applicant has already demonstrated that Ham in view of Iida does not meet all the requirements of independent claim 24. Brookner is relied upon only for its alleged disclosure of setting operations using a display screen and Elgee is relied upon only for its disclosure of the setting section. Clearly, Brookner and Elgee do not

compensate for the above-identified deficiencies of Ham in view of Iida as evidenced by Ito and Ko. Together, the combined teachings of these references would not have (and could not have) led the artisan of ordinary skill to have achieved the subject matter of claim 24. Since claims 25, 27, and 28 depend on claim 24, they are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

Claim 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ham in view of Iida, Brookner, and Elgee. Applicant respectfully traverses these grounds of rejection at least in view of the following exemplary comments.

Independent claim 33 recites features similar to, although not necessarily coextensive with, the features argued above with respect to claim 24. Therefore, arguments presented with respect to claim 24 are respectfully submitted to apply with equal force here. As noted above, Brookner, and Elgee do not compensate for the above-identified deficiencies of Ham and Iida. Accordingly, claim 33 is patentable over Ham in view of Iida, Brookner, and Elgee.

IV. New Claims

In order to provide more varied protection, Applicant adds claims 37 and 38, which are patentable by virtue of their dependency and for additional features set forth therein.

V. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.


Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER



Nataliya Dvorson
Registration No. 56,616

Date: July 17, 2009